

TTFCG Meeting Minutes January 10, 2001

To: Distribution

From: Bob Hunnicutt, Tower Coordinator, Columbia
Telecommunications

A meeting of the Telecommunications Transmission Facility
Coordinating Group (TTFCG) was held on January 10, 2001. The
following people were in attendance:

MEMBERS

Jane Lawton, Chairperson OCA (240) 777-3724 (FAX) 777-3770
Pat Hanehan MCPS (301) 279-3405 (FAX) 279-3737
Willem Van Aller DIST (240) 777-2994 (FAX) 777-2939
Michael Ma M-NCPPC (301) 495-4595 (FAX) 495-1306
Dave Niblock DPS (240) 777-6252 (FAX) 777-6241
Rey Junquera DFS (240) 777-6086 (FAX) 777-6109
Eric Carzon OMB (240) 777-2763 (FAX) 777-2756
Tracey Williams WSSC (301) 206-7171 (FAX) 206-7199

STAFF

Matt DeHaven CTC (410) 964-5700 (FAX) 964-6478
Robert Hunnicutt CTC (410) 964-5700 (FAX) 964-6478
Amy Rowan OCA (240) 777-3684 (FAX) 777-3770

OTHER ATTENDEES

Lee Jarmon Nextel (301) 625-4907 (FAX) 625-5502
Marshall Knight Nextel (301) 625-4907
Deane Mellander Voicestream (240) 264-8658 (FAX) 264-8610
Carolyn Mitchell Cellular One (410) 712-7754 (FAX) 712-7827
Jim Michal Jackson & Campbell (202) 457-1652 (FAX) 457-1678
Tom Fleming MCFR (443) 277-4861
John Todd GPD Telecom (330) 283-6616
Said Bisyr TRW (240) 863-1711
Chris Scott AT&T
Ed Donohue Cole, Raywid/ATT (202) 659-9750 (FAX) 452-0067
Jamie Stepowany Crown Castle TEA
Charles Ryan LCC/XM Satellite (703) 873-2393 (FAX) 873-2686
Wally Francis Resident (301) 384-1690
Mary Francis Resident (301) 384-1690
Michael Poorman GPD Telecom (330) 572-2100
Pam Peckham Bechtel (301) 931-4467 (FAX) 937-4862
Greg James LCC/XM Satellite (703) 873-2751

Action Item - Approval of December 6, 2000 Minutes: Pat Hanehan
moved the minutes be approved as written. Dave Niblock
seconded the motion and the minutes were unanimously approved.

Discussion Item - Citizen Correspondence: Jane Lawton distributed
a letter from attorneys representing residents in the matter of the
AT&T Brink Road monopole, which has already been reviewed by
the TTFCG and is pending Special Exception #S-2447, and a letter
from Mr. and Mrs. Francis regarding the AT&T monopole at the S &
W Farm, pending TTFCG review and Special Exception #S-2455.

Discussion Item - Text Amendment Proposal: Jane Lawton asked
the TTFCG members to recall two issues which had previously

been discussed by the group as candidates for a zoning text amendment. The first issue concerned applications which were submitted, reviewed, and recommended, but never further processed by the carrier. Ms. Lawton stated she had asked the Tower Coordinator to work with the Department of Permitting Services to determine how many such cases occurred. She believed there were a high number of applications reviewed by the group, yet never processed by the carrier and that setting an expiration date for TTFCG recommendations was appropriate if that was the case. The second item concerned imposing an application fee. Given the extent of the review process which applications were now undergoing, she believed that an application fee was appropriate. She asked the members to think about those issues for future discussion.

Action Item: XM Satellite Radio application to attach a pole-mounted omni-directional whip antenna above the penthouse wall and a pole-mounted satellite dish on the wall of the existing 142' Air Rights building at 7315 Wisconsin Avenue in Bethesda (Application #200011-04).

Bob Hunnicutt summarized the application. Jane Lawton asked for clarification of how high above the roof the antennas would extend. Charles Ryan explained that the antennas were 4' long and the supporting pole was 10' long, making the total distance 14'. He added that a satellite dish would be located on the roof on skid mounts.

Motion: Willem Van Aller moved the application be recommended. Rey Junquera seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

Action Item: XM Satellite Radio application to attach an omni-directional whip antenna on a 13.5' extension on the top of an existing 126.5' monopole and a satellite dish antenna at the 50' level on the Bethesda Country Club monopole located at 7601 Bradley Boulevard in Bethesda (Application #200011-06).

Bob Hunnicutt summarized the application and read from a letter received from XM Satellite requesting attachment to the Cellular One monopole also at this location because AT&T refused to allow XM Satellite to attach to its monopole as proposed. Mr. Hunnicutt asked Mr. Ryan to explain the letter and clarify whether this was a request to withdraw this application.

Mr. Ryan explained that this was a case similar to the Cellular One/Nextel situation, where AT&T has a one-for-one swap policy for carriers to attach to AT&T structures. Since XM Satellite did not construct any towers, AT&T had taken a position that it would not permit XM Satellite to attach to AT&T facilities. Consequently, XM Satellite was requesting to attach to the Cellular One monopole at the Bethesda Country Club location.

Jim Michal corrected Mr. Ryan, noting that the second monopole was owned by Sprint. Jane Lawton asked Ed Donohue to find out the details of AT&T's position on co-location on its structures and reminded him that the metal-for-metal policy was a problem for applications in Montgomery County and that she did not

understand why other carriers could not attach to AT&T structures.

This application was withdrawn by Charles Ryan, the carrier's representative.

Action Item: Nextel Communications application to attach antennas at the 100' level on an existing 183' monopole on the Weitzer Property located at 18809 River Road (aka 14705 Sugarland Road) in Poolesville (Application #200012-01).

Bob Hunnicutt summarized the application and noted that he had asked for the FCC Antenna Structure Registration (ASR) number from Nextel but had not been provided that information. He asked the Nextel representative, Lee Jarmon, if he had that number available. Mr. Jarmon replied he did not provide the number because the monopole was not over 200' tall. Mr. Hunnicutt replied that the reason he asked for the ASR number was because he believed that monopole was in the flight path to Dulles Airport, which also required FCC registration.

Mr. Hunnicutt reminded the group that last March it approved changes to the application in order to request ASR information. In May, Mr. Hunnicutt had reported to the group that some of the carriers objected to having to obtain the ASR number but the matter was not discussed because Mr. Van Aller, who had first raised this issue, was not present at that meeting. He stated the group had never concluded those discussions and asked for guidance on whether or not to continue requiring the ASR number for applicable applications. He noted that since the March meeting, all of the carriers except Nextel and one AT&T application had either provided the ASR number or provided a comment that the ASR application was pending. Mr. Hunnicutt asked the group if they wished to change their position in this matter.

Mr. Van Aller stated he believed the ASR number should continue to be a requirement and the ASR number should be added in the TTFCG database. Ms. Lawton said since the carriers were complying with the request, there was no reason to discontinue obtaining the information and believed it would be a useful source of information for tower locations. She directed Mr. Hunnicutt to continue requesting the ASR number and to add that information to the TTFCG database.

Motion: Willem Van Aller moved the application be recommended, conditioned on any modifications to the Special Exception as may be necessary and providing the TTFCG with the ASR number. Tracey Williams seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

Action Item: AT&T Wireless application to attach antennas at the 205' level on an existing 212' WSSC lattice tower located at 23720 Log House Road in Gaithersburg (Application #200012-02).

Bob Hunnicutt summarized the application. Jane Lawton asked how long the facility had been at that location. Dave Niblock stated he believed the facility was 3 or 4 years old. Jane Lawton asked if

there were any approvals required of WSSC for the original construction of this tower. Ed Donohue stated that there were none. Mr. Van Aller stated that, like the County, the WSSC is exempt from zoning regulations. Tracey Williams stated that WSSC was working with AT&T on this attachment and had no objections to this proposed co-location.

Motion: Dave Niblock moved the application be recommended. Willem Van Aller seconded and the motion was approved with Pat Hanehan abstaining.

Action Item: Nextel Communications application to attach antennas on the roof at the 44' level of a 56' building to be constructed within 18 months by Our Lady of Mercy Church located at 9200 Kensdale Drive in Potomac (Application #200012-03).

Bob Hunnicutt summarized the application and noted that this was an application to co-locate on a building which had not yet been constructed and was not expected to be completed for 18 months according to the construction supervisor on site. He added that he had received a letter from Nextel requesting that this application be withdrawn from the agenda pending submission of revised drawings of the proposed attachment. Mr. Hunnicutt asked Mr. Jarmon to explain the reason for the changes in the drawings.

Mr. Jarmon stated the drawings were being revised pending design changes on the building structure and as soon as the drawings were complete he would forward them to the Tower Coordinator for processing.

Ms. Lawton asked how this could be a by-right attachment if the building was not yet existing. Mr. Hunnicutt stated he viewed this application as similar to others where the group had approved structures to be constructed and then, subsequently, approved attachments to it. In those cases, the TTFCG had conditioned its recommendation on the construction of the structure. He stated that this application was put on the agenda for consideration with the same conditions applying to the recommendation.

Jane Lawton stated she believed this case was different in that in the other cases, which were applications for monopoles - structures that, once having obtained the proper approvals, could be constructed fairly quickly. In this situation, the structure was a building which could not be constructed for 1 to 2 years - a much longer construction period. Ms. Lawton commented that she believed the application was submitted prematurely and asked the group if they had any reasons why they should consider this application at this time.

M.G. Diamond stated that Nextel was evidently going through the coordination process with the builder and that the attachment of the antennas may be an integral part of the building construction process and even part of the building permitting process, so it was appropriate to submit the application at this time. Mr. Diamond added that he believed this was the same situation as a monopole that had not yet been constructed.

Jane Lawton stated she still believed it was too soon to submit this type of attachment, especially when the siting is in a residential area, and asked what the downside would be in tabling this item.

Rey Junquera asked what the benefit would be to the carrier in having the review completed at this time. Mr. Van Aller stated he believed that the attachment would be an integral part of the building design. Dave Niblock stated it may be a benefit to the carrier because it would then be the first to attach to the site. Jane Lawton concluded that the group should consider these issues prior to the resubmission of the application.

Mr. Hunnicutt asked Nextel to please address the issues raised in the meeting as part of the cover letter when they submit the revised drawings. Mr. Jarmon agreed they would do so.

Motion: This application was tabled at the request of the carrier, pending submission of revised drawings.

Action Item: Nextel Communications application to attach antennas at the 120' level on the existing 225' Hights Branch lattice tower located at 6300 Damascus Road in Laytonsville (Application #200012-05).

Bob Hunnicutt summarized the application and noted that this recommendation was conditioned on any modifications to the Special Exception as may be necessary since Nextel planned to expand the ground space for the equipment beyond what was approved in the Special Exception.

Lee Jarmon stated that to avoid going through the Special Exception modification process, Nextel had revised its drawings to place its equipment shelter within the existing compound. He then submitted the revised drawings to the Tower Coordinator. Mr. Van Aller commented that it would be a very tight fit for Nextel to stay within the compound area.

Michael Ma asked if, during its review, the Tower Coordinator considers making adjustments to permit subsequent attachments so that other carriers would have room on the tower in the future. He suggested this would enable the facility to accommodate more carriers.

Mr. Hunnicutt replied that he considered whether there were structural issues involved at the time of subsequent attachments and if there were, he would then request structural analysis from the carrier. The attachment height was left up to the carrier because the elevation was based on the service design criteria established by the carrier's engineering staff. Mr. Hunnicutt added that if subsequent carriers considered attachment to a structure and there was no room, the carriers sometimes worked together to adjust their facilities to accommodate additional antennas on towers.

Motion: Dave Niblock moved the application be recommended conditioned on obtaining modifications to the Special Exception as may be necessary. Rey Junquera seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

Action Item: XM Satellite Radio application to mount an omni-directional whip antenna to a 12' extension at the 148' level and attach a satellite dish antenna at the 40' level on an existing PEPCO transmission tower #652-S located on Falls Road in Rockville (Application #200012-08).

Bob Hunnicutt summarized the application and noted that XM Satellite would be attaching its antennas somewhat above the existing AT&T antennas at the top of the PEPCO tower. He noted there would be an additional equipment platform on the ground.

Michael Ma asked if the equipment shed would be on a platform and what size it would be. Charles Ryan explained that XM's standard equipment sheds are 3' x 4' x 5' and that PEPCO liked to have equipment shelters placed on wooden platforms and that would be XM's equipment configuration, also. Tracey Williams asked how often maintenance was performed on the antennas. Mr. Ryan replied that PEPCO advised them of scheduled outages to facilitate attachment and subsequent maintenance as may be necessary.

Motion: Eric Carzon moved the application be recommended. Tracey Williams seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to attach a repeater antenna on the roof at the 39' level on the E-Link building located at 6708 Wisconsin Avenue in Bethesda (Application #200012-09).

Bob Hunnicutt summarized the application and noted that this was the same facility reviewed by the TTFCG a few months ago at which time it was initially uncertain if the height of the building met the code requirements. He stated that subsequent to further review it was determined that the building height was sufficient to permit antenna attachment. He also noted that this application was for in-building coverage.

Jim Michal stated that this attachment was to provide in-building coverage for its client, E-Link, and he displayed a sample antenna to illustrate the nature of the attachment. In response to questions, Mr. Michal stated the antenna would be attached to a small tripod on the roof of the building and directed toward the nearest typical Sprint cellular array.

Motion: Rey Junquera moved the application be recommended. Willem Van Aller seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

Action Item: AT&T Wireless application to attach antennas at the 134' level on an existing PEPCO transmission tower #85R-500A1 located in the 2400 block of Georgia Avenue in Brookeville (Application #200012-10).

Bob Hunnicutt summarized the application. Dave Niblock noted that the address should be 24000 Georgia Avenue.

Motion: Dave Niblock moved the application be recommended. Eric Carzon seconded and the motion was approved with Pat Hanehan abstaining.

Action Item: Montgomery County application to attach antennas at the 76' and 106' level on a 106' PEPCO utility pole to be erected in place of an existing 45' PEPCO utility pole on Riverwood Drive in Potomac (Application #200012-06).

Action Item: Montgomery County application to construct a new 106' monopole on the Johnson property located at Rivers Edge Drive in Potomac (Application #200012-07).

Bob Hunnicutt stated that both of the Montgomery County applications should be considered together because they are both part of the 800 MHz radio system to provide public safety radio coverage along the Potomac River. The County Fire and Rescue 800 MHz consultants had advised that these are the last two of six sites dedicated to providing that coverage. Three of those sites are located in Virginia, and three are in Montgomery County. He reminded the group that they reviewed the first Montgomery County site at the last meeting and it was the PEPCO pole replacement on Sangamore Road. He stated that because these sitings were somewhat different than the typical cellular provider sitings, and that since representatives from the County's engineering firm, GPD, were present at the meeting, he asked them to give a brief description of these services.

John Todd introduced himself and stated that, initially, tests were performed from a boat on the River to simulate coverage from the present 800 MHz base stations. He stated the test results confirmed that the signals would not reach boats on the River. Consequently, the County had selected the six sites referenced by Mr. Hunnicutt, each of which will have bi-directional amplifiers to "re-radiate" signals received from the 800 MHz base stations to radio receivers on the Potomac River. He stated that the six sites would be used by both the Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Service and the Virginia fire and rescue services to provide adequate coverage along the Potomac River. He stated that the poles used to hold the County antennas were 120' Class H Douglas fir poles. He added that a 24" x 24" amplifier box would be placed at about the 10' level on each pole. He stated they used standard AC power and that the amplifiers must have line-of-sight to the County's base station.

Jane Lawton asked if the County had met with the nearby residents regarding the placement of these poles. Mr. Todd said they had outreach to the residents and are working with nearby residents at each location.

Jim Michal asked if the County would make these poles available to commercial carriers for co-location. Mr. Van Aller said that due to the nature of the poles, there were some structural limitations. Rey Junquera added that if it was feasible, the County would review each request for co-location using either of these poles, or, they could request to replace the pole with a regular monopole. Mr. Michal asserted that it would be in the common interest of all the carriers if the County were to construct a monopole which would have sufficient capacity to handle additional cellular arrays from these locations. He added that both of the areas where these poles are being placed have been difficult to site antennas for the commercial carriers as they are in

residential areas.

Mr. Todd stated that the change to different structures would be more costly to the County. Mr. Van Aller added that there were different priorities being considered with these applications than for the typical cellular applications and that public safety along the River was of primary concern for these sitings, not just building a structure that could accommodate other carriers. Michal Ma added that it could be possible to replace the County wooden pole with a monopole at a later date.

Jim Michal asked if it would be possible for the Rivers Edge Drive site to co-locate on the Gymkhana Club monopole. Mr. Hunnicutt stated that in conducting the review, the Tower Coordinator had asked GPD to evaluate use of the Gymkhana Club monopole as well as the WSSC pumping station on River Road in lieu of the replacement of the PEPCO pole on Riverwood Drive. He stated that GPD provided RF propagation maps from each site, which he and Tim Krout reviewed. They concluded that using the alternative sites did not give the complete desired coverage along the River. Mr. Hunnicutt stated that he had advised the County and its consultant that the Verizon monopole to be constructed at the Great Falls Park could also be a likely alternative to the Riverwood Drive site, once that monopole was in place. He added he had asked GPD to look at that site but did not ask for additional RF analysis since that site was not yet constructed and construction did not seem imminent. Regardless, GPD advised him they thought that site was too far back from the River and the additional coverage area that monopole might provide as opposed to the Riverwood site was already covered by the Virginia site at the Madeira School.

Jim Michal asked if the Gymkhana Club site would work if an extension was added to give greater height to meet the County's coverage needs. Ed Donohue replied that AT&T was contemplating a request for Special Exception modification for the Gymkhana Club monopole to extend the height and expected considerable citizen objection because the original Special Exception was negotiated in agreement with the adjoining property owners to limit the height of the monopole to its present size. Mr. Hunnicutt added that the Gymkhana Club Special Exception also limited use of the ground space because it was immediately adjacent to a tree preservation area.

Mr. Todd added that GPD had already put a lot of time and effort into designing this system to work with the wooden poles at the proposed locations and to redesign at this point would delay the project and would add additional cost for the County. Mr. Van Aller added that timing was an important issue because the County was trying to get this network up and running as quickly as possible. Mr. Michal stated that he agreed that public safety was important, especially along this section of the River. He added that, speaking as a citizen, he was concerned about delaying public safety coverage along the River because it is such a dangerous stretch of water and there are deaths there every year.

Jane Lawton suggested the group recommend this application with

a condition that those poles should not be subject to co-location in the interest of minimizing the community impact as well as protecting the County and its public service mission.

Mr. Todd stated there were also technical issues to be considered, such as the filters that GPD and the County had planned to buy for blocking out interfering signals from carriers such as Nextel, which has frequencies close to the County's frequencies. Ed Donohue added that Nextel was on the Gymkhana Club monopole. Eric Carzon stated he believed that the County had already done a lot of work exploring alternatives to these sites and it appeared that there were valid reasons not to use the alternatives. Jane Lawton added that she believed that reconsideration of co-location opportunities would further delay system deployment. She asked the County and GPD if they would consider running additional analysis using the three alternative sites mentioned in today's meeting.

Mr. Ma stated that if there were questions such as those raised in connection with the use of the Gymkhana Club tower as both of these sites go through Mandatory Referral, it was likely that those questions would be raised at the Park & Planning Commission also. He suggested it would be in the interest of expediting Mandatory Referral to have the answers to those questions prior to the Commission's hearing. Pat Hanehan stated he could support the applications if they were subject to further County review of alternative sites. Jane Lawton stated she believed the group had adequately looked at the uniqueness of these locations, and in the interest of expediting these applications, she thought it was appropriate for the group to recommend the applications. She added that she would like to have the group's discussion regarding further consideration of alternative sites clearly reflected in the minutes. Ms. Lawton asked the Tower Coordinator to e-mail the minutes of this item to the group members to ensure that an appropriate representation of the discussion was recorded.

Motion: Dave Niblock moved that both applications be recommended. Rey Junquera seconded and the motion was approved with Pat Hanehan opposing and Eric Carzon and Willem Van Aller abstaining.

Action Item: AT&T Wireless application to construct a new 130' monopole on the S & W Farm located at 1506 Briggs Chaney Road in Silver Spring (Application #200010-07).

Bob Hunnicutt summarized the application. He noted that he first asked AT&T for additional RF propagation maps showing AT&T antennas on the Bell Atlantic facility, which was missing from the first set of RF maps submitted by AT&T. He also had requested that AT&T investigate the use of the minaret at the Mosque. AT&T replied that the mosque was ruled out for a number of reasons, including the difficulty of attaching antennas to the stone face of the minaret. He added that there were other zoning problems associated with the Mosque already, and regardless, the mosque owners stated they did not wish to have AT&T's antennas on their property.

The Tower Coordinator also asked AT&T to consider use of micro cells attached to PEPCO poles along Briggs Chaney Road. AT&T

subsequently submitted additional RF propagation maps showing that the use of micro cell sites suggested by the Tower Coordinator would not adequately serve the desired coverage area. The Tower Coordinator, on review of the AT&T submission, concurred.

Mr. Hunnicutt added that in response to requests from citizens, he was asked to consider use of commercial areas along Route 650 and Briggs Chaney Road, and Route 29 and Briggs Chaney Road. He stated that the review determined that if the antennas were on the Route 29 portion of Briggs Chaney Road, there would be insufficient signal coverage along the western end of Briggs Chaney Road, and vice-versa.

Mr. Hunnicutt added that prior to today's TTFCG meeting, Michael Ma had contacted him, and as requested, he and Tim Krout reviewed two other alternatives. One alternative was to increase signal strength of the antennas at existing locations on Route 29 and north of Briggs Chaney Road off of Route 650. The second alternative was to consider use of property along Briggs Chaney Road other than the S & W Farm property. Mr. Hunnicutt stated that Mr. Krout explained that even if signal strength was increased, it did not appear that signals would adequately cover the "dips" in terrain along Briggs Chaney Road where service was desired to be provided. He added that they informed Mr. Ma that the surrounding ground elevation in the vicinity around the S & W Farm seemed to be fairly level and that it was likely that another piece of property in that general vicinity would provide as adequate coverage as locating the monopole on the S & W Farm property. However, he had asked Mr. Ma to check with the AT&T engineers to determine their response to the alternatives as well. Mr. Ma stated he spoke with AT&T representatives and asked them to address those issues at today's meeting. He brought a large site map available to review for discussion purposes.

Ms. Lawton noted that Mr. and Mrs. Francis, neighboring property owners, were at the meeting and noted they had written a very well crafted letter expressing their concerns about this siting and wanted to give them the opportunity to speak. She noted, however, that the TTFCG was not the appropriate venue for citizen input; that was the purpose of the Board of Appeals through the Special Exception process. But she wanted to give the Francis' the opportunity to express their concerns at today's meeting.

Wally Francis stated that he understood from the technical perspective that this may be a reasonable siting, but that from every other perspective it was a disaster to the community. He stated that it was a residential area, in an environmentally sensitive zone, and the use of the farm property was inappropriate. Ms. Lawton asked him to explain the environmental issues. Mr. Francis stated that the Cloverly Master Plan identified this as an area of concern because of water runoff into the nearby Paint Branch stream, a brown trout spawning and preservation area. Ed Donohue stated that in its reply to the Tower Coordinator, AT&T had addressed that issue by meeting the set-aside requirements for non-impervious soil and was within the environmental regulations in siting at the S & W property.

Mr. Francis stated there had already been other Special Exceptions in that area and the mosque was already there with a number of telecommunications dishes. He stated the community was concerned that additional Special Exceptions may be the start of gradually turning the entire area into a commercial area rather than a residential area. He added that although the recommendation suggested use of a tree monopole, there were not other trees in the field where AT&T planned to put the monopole and it would be quite an eyesore. He stated that if it could be placed on the Montgomery County Public Schools property or parkland property instead, it would be much less obtrusive. He stated that these other areas would have less negative impact on the community and that use of other sites may adequately cover the service area just as well. He also suggested the use of two smaller monopoles strategically placed in less obtrusive areas and did not believe that those kinds of considerations were proposed when looking at alternative sitings.

Ms. Lawton stated that he had raised some very good points and that, in the past, the TTFCG had referred carriers to commercial sites, but the engineering review primarily focused on use of existing structures in the area as alternatives. Further, the TTFCG did not determine land use issues, as that was more appropriate for the Park and Planning Commission and the Board of Appeals.

Mr. Francis stated there were serious drainage problems in the area and that the mosque, with its large parking lot, had dramatically adversely impacted the area from an environmental perspective. He stated that even if AT&T did meet the regulations, it was still a concern.

Ms. Lawton asked if AT&T had met with community members. Ed Donohue replied that AT&T typically sends out letters to the community explaining that a Special Exception had been requested and they had received some comments back from the community association, and they were scheduling a meeting with one association in the area. Mr. Francis stated there should be several interested groups and he could provide the names of the parties involved.

Mr. Donohue introduced Chris Scott, AT&T's RF engineer, who would review the questions raised by Michael Ma. Mr. Scott stated that AT&T already has a number of sites in the area, which he listed for the group. He added that the two sites raised as alternatives for increasing signal strength were the Browns Corner site and the Renaissance Apartments. He stated that the power at each of those sites was already at maximum strength. He added that although the FCC had authorized higher power for AT&T antennas, their equipment was at maximum power output already. He stated that in rural areas, AT&T preferred to have large cell coverage and if it could increase the power output it would, but the equipment limited an increase.

Mrs. Francis asked if AT&T had considered the Volunteer Fire Department monopole on Route 198. Mr. Scott explained that when AT&T initially began providing service in this area, they considered that monopole but subsequently established a cell site at the Sarem Farm to the northeast, which adequately served the

area and negated a need for additional antennas at the VFD monopole.

In response to questions, Mr. Scott stated that additional equipment with higher gain was not currently available. Ed Donohue emphasized that all sites were at maximum capacity and that the equipment was consistent with this market and AT&T's national network.

Mr. Ma asked if the height could be increased at the site on Route 29. Ed Donohue replied that since that site was a building they could not increase the height.

Ms. Lawton asked AT&T what would be possible alternatives. AT&T stated that S&W is the largest parcel in the area and is the preferable location for their monopole space. He added that the MCPS site may be acceptable if they could site the monopole close to the intersection. In response to other questions, he stated that the Mayfair County DPWT depot may be viable, but believed it would miss coverage along the eastern section of Briggs Chaney Road.

In response to questions about use of the Board of Education property, Pat Hanehan stated that there are no plans for a school on the Board of Education property at the time and that they would entertain a request for siting a monopole at that location. Mr. Ma stated that according to his staff at the Park and Planning Commission, there was interest in having that land used for parkland. Mrs. Francis stated if a school was built on that property, it would also have a significant adverse environmental impact.

Ms. Lawton asked if the Board of Education parkland was clear, or would trees have to be removed. Mr. Scott responded that tree removal would be an issue and, typically, communities do not want trees cut down. Ed Donohue added that trees would need to be cleared off the property for an access road as well as the monopole and equipment area. That is not a problem at the S&W site because there are no trees in the immediate vicinity of the proposed monopole location. Ms. Lawton stated that even at the S & W Farm site, she presumed that someone would ask for considerable screening around the monopole and that a tree monopole might make sense at that location. Mr. Francis stated even if that was the case, and a tree monopole was requested, AT&T may appeal that decision and succeed in not having to meet that requirement, as they did in one other recent case. Ed Donohue replied that in that case, a 190' tree monopole was requested, and, since it would be so much taller than any of the surrounding trees, it would look as much out of place as a regular monopole would and would be ineffective in concealing the monopole. Ms. Lawton added that although the TTFCG does not determine land use, they do recommend some stealth applications such as tree monopoles and screening.

Mr. Van Aller added that the WSSC's triple water tanks were approximately 7700 feet to the northwest and that these tanks may also be an acceptable alternative.

Ms. Lawton asked if AT&T would agree to table this application until some of the alternatives discussed at today's meeting could be further pursued by AT&T and that they could report their findings to the TTFCG at the next scheduled meeting. Ed Donohue replied that AT&T would be agreeable to that motion. Ms. Lawton stated that given the late hour of the meeting, those who were interested could stay after the meeting to more clearly define the specific alternatives AT&T would investigate.

Motion: Mr. Van Aller moved the application be tabled. The TTFCG members agreed to revisit the alternative sites and report back at the next meeting. Pat Hanehan abstained from the vote.

Discussion Item - Next Meeting Schedule: Mr. Hunnicutt noted an error on the dates for the next meeting schedule - the March date should be Wednesday, March 7. He asked if the dates listed were agreeable to the group. The group agreed that the next meeting dates would be at 2:00 p.m. on February 7, March 7, April 4, May 2 and June 5.

The next meeting of the TTFCG is scheduled for Wednesday, February 7, 2001 at 2:00 p.m. in the Consumer Affairs Conference Room #225 of the COB.

Discussion Item – Tower Applications Statistical Report: Jane Lawton reviewed the latest statistics for processing applications, and noted that of the 335 applications reviewed by the TTFCG, 318, or 92%, were for co-location on existing structures. Only 7% of the total were for new towers or monopoles. She commended the work of the group and the carriers in their success of meeting the County's objective of attaching to existing structures.

Action Item – Approval of February 7, 2001 Minutes: Pat Hanehan noted that on page 7 of the minutes he was listed as seconding a motion on an AT&T item. He said that is incorrect because he always abstains from action on AT&T items. Jane Lawton asked the Tower Coordinator to check his notes from the meeting and make corrections as appropriate in the minutes. Pat Hanehan moved the minutes be approved as corrected. Dave Niblock seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

Action Item: XM Satellite Radio application to attach an omni-directional whip antenna on a 12' extension on the top of an existing 160' monopole and a satellite dish antenna at the 50' level on the Bethesda Country Club monopole located at 7601 Bradley Boulevard in Bethesda (Application #200101-03).

Tim Krout stated that he was prepared to present this application at today's meeting until he received a letter from Charles Ryan indicating that there was an unresolved structural issue with its attachment to the Sprint monopole. He suggested that the item be tabled until those issues were resolved.

Bob Hunnicutt added that he had received a call from Katherine Freeman of the Board of Appeals, who also expressed some

concern and confusion as to what XM was proposing to do at that location.

Motion Item: Pat Hanehan moved the application be tabled. Michael Ma seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: VoiceStream application to attach antennas at the 137' level of an existing 135' PEPCO transmission line tower #29-S located at 19650 Peach Tree Road in Barnesville (Application #200101-05).

Tim Krout summarized the application and noted that it was a fairly straightforward PEPCO attachment, similar to many of those previously reviewed by the group.

Motion Item: Dave Niblock moved the application be recommended. Michal Ma seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to attach antennas to a powermount at the 141' level of an existing 126' PEPCO transmission line tower #29-N located at 19500 Peach Tree Road in Dickerson (Application #200102-01).

Tim Krout summarized the application. Michal Ma asked if the Tower Coordinator had visited this site and if landscaping would be provided for the equipment on the ground. He stated he was concerned because this siting was very close to the roadway.

Bob Hunnicutt stated that this was a fairly routine application and he did not feel it was necessary to visit the site. He added that the Sprint equipment was not within a typical shelter but was on a wooden platform, as had been explained at previous meetings. Dave Niblock also stated that this had been discussed at an earlier meeting, and noted that PEPCO could not be required to ask carriers to landscape their facilities in the PEPCO right-of-way. M.G. Diamond reminded the group that at a recent meeting, the PEPCO representative stated PEPCO preferred not to have landscaping because of the potential fire hazard. Mr. Hunnicutt stated he would check with Don Collison at PEPCO and Cliff Royalty at the County Attorney's office to get answers to these questions and report back to the group at the next meeting. He also agreed to visit the site and report back on the visibility of the equipment at the base of the transmission tower.

Motion Item: Dave Niblock moved the application be recommended. Willem Van Aller seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: U.S. Wireless application to attach antennas to the penthouse wall at the 188' level of the existing 170' The Chateau building located at 9727 Mt. Pisgah Road in Silver Spring (Application #200102-04).

Tim Krout summarized the application, noting that this was a receive-only site, so there were no concerns regarding cumulative RF emissions despite the fact that there were a number of antennas already located on this rooftop.

Mr. Van Aller commented that this building has been used as an antenna site since around 1960, so he is not surprised to see so many attachments on the roof, and he speculated that some of them were no longer in use.

Jane Lawton asked the Tower Coordinator to write to the company who manages this rooftop to notify them of the group's concern regarding the number of antennas and ascertain their plans for removing inactive antennas on the roof.

Jim Michal stated that the management company was Southern Management and the Tower Coordinator could contact Ronnie Frank at Tyson's Corner to obtain that information.

Motion Item: Willem Van Aller moved the application be recommended. Michal Ma seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.**Action Item:** AT&T Wireless application to pole mount antennas 5' above the penthouse at the 84' level of an existing 60' building at the Wayne Manchester Towers located at 75 E. Wayne Avenue in Silver Spring (Application #200102-05).

Tim Krout summarized the application. Dave Niblock asked if this was the correct address. Mr. Hunnicutt assured him it was, although the original application was submitted with the building as 25 Wayne Avenue. When he visited the site, however, he discovered that the application had the wrong address and the diagram showed the antennas on the wrong building. He stated that AT&T had submitted revised drawings and verified that the address was 75 Wayne Avenue.

Dave Niblock noted that he had already received the building permit application, which also referenced the incorrect address, and that he would work with AT&T to make the correction.

Motion Item: Willem Van Aller moved the application be recommended. Michal Ma seconded the motion and it was approved with Pat Hanehan abstaining.

Action Item: airBand Communications application to attach antennas on the walls & roof of the penthouse at approximately 199' & 209' on the Democracy Center building located at 6903 Rockledge Drive in Bethesda (Application #200102-06).

Tim Krout summarized the application and noted that because there were a number of carriers already on the roof and several proposing to attach, this recommendation was conditioned on coordination with the other carriers for equipment placement.

Motion Item: Dave Niblock moved the application be recommended. Willem Van Aller seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: U.S. Wireless application to attach antennas at approximately 250' & 272' on the penthouse of the Grosvenor House building located at 10101 Grosvenor Place in Rockville (Application #200102-07).

Tim Krout summarized the application, again noting that this was a receive-only attachment and although there were numerous

carriers already on this building, there were no cumulative RF emissions concerns.

Dave Niblock noted that the zone should be R-10 not RM, as reflected on the application and Recommendation Form. Bob Hunnicutt agreed to change the records to reflect the correct zoning.

Motion Item: Michael Ma moved the application be recommended. Willem Van Aller seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: U.S. Wireless application to attach antennas at approximately 200' on the penthouse of the Democracy Center building located at 6903 Rockledge Drive in Bethesda (Application #200102-08).

Tim Krout summarized the application, noting that this was a receive-only attachment. He also noted that this application was conditioned on coordination with other carriers for equipment placement.

Jane Lawton asked if the carriers would report back to the TTFCG on the exact placement of their equipment once any conflicts were resolved.

Motion Item: Dave Niblock moved the application be recommended. Michal Ma seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: AT&T Wireless application to construct a 160' Allegheny Power steel transmission line pole to replace an existing 40' wooden Allegheny Power pole #MD-1435 located at 11411 Kingstead Road in Damascus (Application #200102-09).

Tim Krout summarized the application, noting that this was, in effect, placement of a new monopole since the pole that was being replaced was only 40' tall.

Jane Lawton noted that Allegheny said it would check with the neighbors to see if there were any objections to this 160' monopole. Mr. Hunnicutt noted that he had asked AT&T to explain why the tower needed to be 160' in height and AT&